

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,257	02/15/2002	Yoram Reiter	02/23338	9820
75	90 02/25/2005		EXAMINER	
SOL SHEINBEIN			VANDERVEGT, FRANCOIS P	
c/o ANTHONY CASTORINA SUITE 207			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON, VA 22202			1644	
			DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/075,257	REITER, YORAM	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		F. Pierre VanderVegt	1644	
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence addres	'S
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, unsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic or period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may ication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of the tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mil, by statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this commun ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>29 <i>November</i> 2004</u> .		
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition fo closed in accordance with the practice	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		rits is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□	Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 5-14 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	hdrawn from consideration.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
9)	The specification is objected to by the l	Examiner.		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	ı)□ accepted or b)□ objected t	o by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection	÷,,		
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to be	·		٠.
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action to	ocuments have been received. Ocuments have been received in the priority documents have been large (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stag	je
Attachmen	ıt(s)			
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		v Summary (PTO-413)	
3) 🔲 Infor	ee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT er No(s)/Mail Date	_	o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152))

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

This application is a continuation of U.S. Application Serial Number 09/534,966. Claims 1-14 are currently pending.

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 1-4 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on April 22, 2004.

Claims 5-14 are the subject of examination in the present Office Action.

2. In view of Applicant's arguments filed November 29, 2004, the following ground of rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 5-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altman et al (Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (USA) [1993] 90:10330-10334; U on form PTO-892) in view of Matsumura et al (J. Biol. Chem. [1992] 267(33): 23589-23595; V on form PTO-892).

It was previously stated: "Altman teaches a method for the production of soluble functional MHC class II complexes in *E. coli* (see entire document). Altman teaches the purification of MHC class II from inclusion bodies and the in vitro refolding of the MHC molecules. Altman teaches the association of the MHC molecules with antigenic peptides. Altman teaches that no other proteins are required for the efficient folding of the MHC molecules and that carbohydrate modification is not necessary for T cell recognition. Altman teaches that production in *E. coli* provides large quantities of MHC molecules needed for conformational and functional studies (page 10334 in particular). Altman teaches that production of empty MHC class I molecules is possible, but is inhibited by the instability of the complex at physiological temperatures (page 10334 in particular).

Altman does not teach the production of MHC class I molecules.

Matsumura teaches the production of soluble empty MHC class I molecules in Drosophila melanogaster cells and the binding of peptides to the complexes (see entire document).

Application/Control Number: 10/075,257

Art Unit: 1644

It would have been prima facie obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of Altman to produce the MHC class I molecules of Matsumura in *E. coli*. One would have been motivated to combine the teachings with a reasonable expectation of success by the teaching of Altman that MHC molecules do not need accessory molecules for folding and that they do not need glycosylation to be functional. One would have been further motivated by the teaching of Matsumura that empty MHC class I molecules are stable at lower temperature and can be loaded with antigenic peptides. It is well known in the art that E. coli can be easily cultivated at temperatures at least as low as 4 degrees C. Accordingly, the artisan would have expected to be able to produce large quantities of functional MHC class I molecules at a low cost through use of the combined methods."

Applicant's arguments filed November 29, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the Altman reference is not applicable because the MHC class I constructs taught by Altman are unstable at physiological temperatures. Applicant argues therefore that the MHC class I constructs of Altman are not functional. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., functional at physiological temperatures) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Altman teaches the association of the soluble MHC class I constructs with an antigenic peptide. This is an art-recognized function of MHC class I molecules and therefore fully satisfies the metes and bounds of the claims as presented. Accordingly, the ground of rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

- 4. No claim is allowed.
- 5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Pierre VanderVegt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0852. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:30-4:00; Alternate Fridays 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

F. Pierre VanderVegt, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner February 16, 2005

Page 4

PRIMARY EXAMINER 2/17/05